arXiv:1410.4275v3 [stat.ME] 29 Jun 2016

A consistent estimator of the proportion of nonzero Normal means under certain strong covariance dependence

Xiongzhi Chen* and Rebecca W. Doerge†

Abstract

Motivated by multiple testing related to marginal regression analysis for dependent high-dimensional data, we consider multiple testing which components of a Normal random vector have zero means, where the proportion of components that have nonzero means plays an important role. We construct a consistent estimator of the proportion when components of the Normal random vector can be strongly dependent. Our estimator is perhaps the first among estimators of this proportion that has theoretically ensured consistency under strong dependence. It is accurate and stable as demonstrated by extensive simulation studies. Its utility is illustrated by an application to multiple testing related to an association study based on brain imaging data.

Keywords: Concave partially penalized least squares; Fourier transform; multiple hypothesis testing; proportion of nonzero Normal means; proportion of true null hypotheses.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 62H15, 62F12; Secondary 62H25.

1 Introduction

Estimating the proportion π_0 of true null hypotheses is of considerable importance due to the routine implementation of false discovery rate (FDR) control in various scientific endeavors, such as genomics, neuroscience, economics and finance. The proportion π_0 is the key ingredient of many adaptive FDR procedures (Storey et al.; 2004; Benjamini et al.; 2006; Blanchard and

*Corresponding author. Center for Statistics and Machine Learning and Lewis-Sigler Institute, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA; E-mail: xiongzhi@princeton.edu.

†Department of Statistics and Department of Agronomy, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA; E-mail: doerge@purdue.edu.

Roquain; 2009), such that a less conservative estimator of π_0 tends to make the corresponding FDR procedures more powerful (Benjamini and Yekutieli; 2001). It is also the key component of the two-groups models and local FDR (Efron et al.; 2001; Ploner et al.; 2006) and the positive FDR and q-value (Storey; 2003), such that an accurate estimate of π_0 is needed to determine the two-groups models and that a more accurate estimate of π_0 leads to more accurate estimates of the local FDR, FDR or q-value of the corresponding FDR procedures.

Equally important is the dual quantity, $\pi = 1 - \pi_0$, the proportion of false nulls, and an accurate estimate of π induces an accurate estimate of π_0. Most existing estimators of π_0 or π, including those in Storey (2002); Langaas et al. (2005); Benjamini et al. (2006); Jin (2008), were developed under the assumption that the p-values or test statistics are weakly dependent. However, p-values and test statistics derived from high-dimensional data can be strongly dependent (see examples in Klebanov and Yakovlev (2007); Leek and Storey (2008)), and none of these estimators have been shown to be consistent under strong dependence.

Motivated by multiple testing for marginal regression analysis for dependent high-dimensional data, we consider estimating the proportion of components of a Normal random vector that have nonzero means. More specifically, suppose the vector $\mathbf{Z}$ is Normally distributed with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, ..., \mu_m)^T$ and a known correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ representing certain types of strong dependence. Consider simultaneously testing the null hypothesis $H_i : \mu_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. We will construct a consistent estimator of the proportion of nonzero Normal means,

$$\pi = m^{-1} \left| \{1 \leq i \leq m : \mu_i \neq 0\} \right| \tag{1}$$

when the correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ encodes strong covariance dependence and has a few dominant eigenvalues.

The new estimator provides a partial but positive answer to the quest suggested by Fan, Han and Gu (2012) on consistently estimating the proportion of nonzero Normal means under arbitrary covariance dependence. It is perhaps the first among estimators of this proportion that has theoretically ensured consistency under strong dependence. Two by-products of developing the new estimator are an extension to more general settings of the Fourier transform method to

estimate π in Jin (2008) and an alternative method to estimate the (principal) factors in order to adjust for dependence in multiple testing; see details in Section 4.3 and Section 4.2.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. The motivation for the setup of the problem is given in Section 2, and an application of the new estimator to multiple testing in an association study based on brain imaging data is provided in Section 3. We develop the consistent estimator of π in Section 4 and present simulation studies on it in Section 5. We end the article with a discussion in Section 6. This article has supplementary material.

2 Motivation of study

The setup for multiple testing which components of a Normal random vector have zero means when their correlation matrix is known is motivated by multiple testing for marginal regression analysis for dependent high-dimensional data; see Owen (2005), Fan, Han and Gu (2012) and Azriel and Schwartzman (2015) for examples of such analyses in gene expression studies, genome wide association studies and brain imaging analysis, respectively. In these studies, the aim is to identify covariates that are associated with the response variable when there are many candidate covariates while maintaining the FDR at a target level. To this end, the response variable is regressed on each covariate to produce an estimated regression coefficient. Then multiple testing is conducted to assess which regression coefficients are nonzero statistically, and conclusions are drawn on which covariates are associated with the response variable.

To formally state the above procedure, let y be the response variable and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be the covariates. The ith null hypothesis $\tilde{H}_i$ is "no association between y and x_i", and the multiple testing problem is to simultaneously assess the null hypotheses $\{\tilde{H}_i\}_{i=1}^m$. Let $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be a sample of y and $\{x_{ij}\}_{j=1}^n$ be a sample of x_i for each i, where $m \gg n$ usually holds. For each i, the marginal regression model

$$y_j = \alpha_{i0} + \alpha_{i1} x_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \tag{2}$$

is used, where ε_{ij}'s are i.i.d. with mean 0 and standard deviation τ. This converts testing $\tilde{H}_i$ to testing if $\alpha_{i1} = 0$.

Let $\hat{\alpha}_{i1}$ be the least squares estimate of α_{i1}, s_k be the sample standard deviation of x_k, and

$$Z_i = \frac{\hat{\alpha}_{i1}}{\tau / (\sqrt{n} s_i)}. \tag{3}$$

Then, when n is not very small, each Z_i will be approximately Normally distributed with mean $\mu_i = \sqrt{n}\alpha_{i1}s_i/\tau$ and standard deviation 1. When ε_{ij}'s are Normally distributed, $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_m)^T$, conditioning on all x_{ij}'s, is Normally distributed with mean vector

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m)^T \quad \text{with} \quad \mu_i = \sqrt{n}\alpha_{i1}s_i/\tau \tag{4}$$

and covariance matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = (r_{kl}), \text{ where } r_{kl} \text{ is the sample correlation between } x_k \text{ and } x_l \tag{5}$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is a correlation matrix since Z_i's have standard deviation 1.

Now testing if $\alpha_{i1} = 0$ is equivalent to testing $H_i : \mu_i = 0$ using $\mathbf{Z}$, i.e., assessing if an x_i is associated with y is converted to testing $H_i : \mu_i = 0$. In other words, we are testing which components of the Normal random vector $\mathbf{Z}$ have zero means. To control the FDR or estimate the local FDR or q-value when simultaneously testing $H_i : \mu_i = 0$ for $1 \le i \le m$, the proportion of nonzero Normal means π defined in (1), i.e., $\pi = m^{-1} |\{1 \le i \le m : \mu_i \ne 0\}|$ needs to be estimated accurately.

We would like to emphasize that the population covariance matrix of $\mathbf{Z}$ is the correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ and that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is known based on the sample x_{ij} for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$ when τ is known. In practice, τ^2 can be estimated by

$$\hat{\tau}^2 = \frac{1}{m(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\tilde{y}_j - \hat{\alpha}_{i1}\tilde{x}_{ij})^2$$

when $n > 2$, where $\tilde{x}_{ij} = x_{ij} - n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij}$ and $\tilde{y}_j = y_j - n^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_j$. Since $m(n-2)$ is usually large, the variability of $\hat{\tau}^2$ can be ignored so that $\hat{\tau}^2$ can be taken as τ^2. If we set $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \left(\tilde{Z}_1, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_m\right)^T$ with $\tilde{Z}_i = \frac{\hat{\alpha}_{i1}}{\hat{\tau}/(\sqrt{n}s_i)}$, then $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ can be regarded as having the same distribution

as $\mathbf{Z}$. Correspondingly, we are back to testing which components of the Normal random vector $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ have nonzero means with a known correlation matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$.

3 An application: multiple testing in association study

As an application, we apply the new estimator to estimate the proportion of nonzero Normal means after marginal regression analysis has been applied to a high-dimensional data set. The data set was obtained from brain imaging in a study of the cortical thickness of adults who had a diagnosis of attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) as children (Proal et al.; 2011). The data set contains cortical thickness measurements for around $80,000$ cortical voxels and behavioral measurements for each of the $n = 139$ individuals. Here we would like to identify voxels that may affect the overall behavior of an individual by assessing the association between the cortical thickness of each voxel to a global assessment of behavior. Namely, the response variable is the global assessment of behavior and the covariates are the voxel-wise cortical thicknesses.

The marginal regression analysis described in Section 2 is applied to the data set. To ensure the Normality assumption in each marginal regression model is not seriously violated, we apply the Shapiro test to assess the Normality of the residuals for each marginal regression and select Z_i's for which the Shapiro test has p-value > 0.05. Among these Z_i's, we further select those whose absolute values are ≥ 0.45 and whose correlation matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is approximately structured; see panels (b), (c) and (d) of Figure 1. This gives $m = 1000$ test statistics Z_i, whose histogram is shown in panel (a) of Figure 1. Coincidentally, the minimal absolute value of these Z_i's is 1.548647. However, the correlations between a large proportion of Z_i's are fairly strong; see panel (b) of Figure 1.

Our new estimator $\tilde{\pi}$ of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means is 0.0189 for these Z_i's, i.e., the proportion π_0 of zero Normal means is $1 - 0.0189 = 0.9810$. Thus, only a few voxels are correlated with the global assessment of behavior by their cortical thicknesses. This is consistent with the finding in Azriel and Schwartzman (2015) that in this data set correlations may cause the impression of many true associations. However, the estimators in Benjamini et al. (2006),



Figure 1: Estimating the proportion of Normal test statistics with nonzero means when assessing the association between the global assessment of behavior and cortical thickness of each voxel. Panel (a) is the empirical density of the test statistics, approximated by the blue curve obtained using the method in Azriel and Schwartzman (2015). Panel (b) is the heat map of the correlation matrix for the test statistics. It shows that the dependence among the test statistics is strong but approximately structured. Panel (c) displays the histogram of the correlations between the test statistics. It shows that a large proportion of the test statistics are strongly correlated. Panel (d) shows the largest 20 eigenvalues of the correlation matrix, for which the largest eigenvalue dominates.

Wang et al. (2011) and Langaas et al. (2005) estimate π_0 to be 0.5101, 0 and 0.00002 respectively, which are all misleading.

On the other hand, π being estimated to be 0.0189 by our estimator suggests that almost all Z_i's under consideration have mean 0. Consequently, the empirical density of these Z_i's may be approximated by the random function developed in Azriel and Schwartzman (2015). We applied their random function with 13 latent variables, which seems to give the best approximation among choices of different numbers of latent variables; see the blue curve in panel (a) of Figure 1. It can be seen that the approximation is good. This is consistent with our estimate of π being

0.0189. However, the use of 13 latent variables by the random function in the approximation reflects the fact that there are a few voxels that are associated with the global assessment of behavior and that the correlations among the test statistics Z_i cannot be fully accounted for by few latent variables or principal factors; see panel (b) of Figure 1.

4 Consistently estimating the proportion

Our strategy to develop the consistent estimator of π is explained as follows. First, we utilize the *principal factor approximation* (PFA) developed in Fan, Han and Gu (2012) to decompose $\mathbf{Z}$ into two independent Normal random vectors, such that the major vector contributes the major part of the covariance dependence between the components of $\mathbf{Z}$ and the minor vector consists of "weakly dependent" (to be specified in Section 4.1) random variables. We then estimate the major vector. To do this, we establish two properties of a type of *concave partially penalized least squares* (CPPLS) estimate when the involved Normal random errors have heterogenous variances and are weakly dependent and when there are incidental parameters. Finally, we extend the *Fourier transform method* (FTM) to estimate π in Jin (2008) to the case of weakly dependent Normal random errors with heterogeneous variances, and apply the extended FTM to components of the mean-shifted, estimated minor vector to estimate π consistently.

Before presenting the theory, we introduce some conventions and notations. We take the convention that a vector is always a column vector, and use $\mathbf{p} \sim \mathsf{N}_m(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{S})$ to denote that $\mathbf{p}$ is an m-dimensional Normally distributed random vector with mean vector $\mathbf{u}$ and covariance matrix $\mathbf{S}$. Further, for two sequences $\{b_m\}_{m\geq 1}$ and $\{b_m^*\}_{m\geq 1}$, the "big O" notation $b_m = O(b_m^*)$ means that $|b_m| \leq C|b_m^*|$ for some constant $C > 0$ for sufficiently large m; for two positive sequences $\{b_m\}_{m\geq 1}$ and $\{b_m^*\}_{m\geq 1}$, the "small o" notation $b_m = o(b_m^*)$ means that $\lim_{m\to\infty} b_m (b_m^*)^{-1} = 0$. Finally, $\mathbb{P}$ denotes the probability measure and $\mathbb{E}$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}$.

4.1 Decomposing the Normal vector via PFA

Recall that $\mathbf{Z}$ is an m-dimensional Normal vector with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, ..., \mu_m)^T$ and a known correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Let the spectral decomposition of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ have eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq$

$\lambda_m \geq 0$ and corresponding orthonormal eigenvectors $\boldsymbol{\rho}_i$, $i = 1, ..., m$. It is easy to verify that for a fixed $\delta > 0$ there exists k between 0 and $m-1$ (k is dependent on m) such that

$$m^{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_{k+1}^2 + ... + \lambda_m^2} = O\left(m^{-\delta}\right). \tag{6}$$

Assume m is large and pick k such that (6) holds. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = (\tilde{w}_1, ..., \tilde{w}_m)^T \sim \mathsf{N}_m(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$, $\mathbf{w}_k^* = (\tilde{w}_1, ..., \tilde{w}_k)^T$, $\mathbf{G}_k = \left(\sqrt{\lambda_1}\boldsymbol{\rho}_1, \cdots, \sqrt{\lambda_k}\boldsymbol{\rho}_k\right)$ and $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{j=k+1}^m \sqrt{\lambda_j}\boldsymbol{\rho}_j\tilde{w}_j = (v_1, ..., v_m)^T$, where $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix. Then we have

$$\mathbf{Z} = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{G}_k\mathbf{w}_k^* + \mathbf{v}, \tag{7}$$

or equivalently $\mathbf{Z} = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\eta} + \mathbf{v}$ upon setting $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{G}_k\mathbf{w}_k^*$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is independent of $\mathbf{v}$, and both are m-dimensional Normal random vectors. Components of $\mathbf{w}_k^*$ are called the "principal factors" in Fan, Han and Gu (2012).

Let $\mathbf{C} = (c_{ij})_{m\times m}$ be the covariance matrix of $\mathbf{v}$. Since k has been chosen such that (6) holds, we see

$$m^{-2}\sum_{1\leq i,j\leq m}|c_{ij}| \leq m^{-1}\|\mathbf{C}\|_F = O\left(m^{-\delta}\right), \tag{8}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix. In this case, components of $\mathbf{v}$ are called "weakly dependent" by Fan, Han and Gu (2012). In view of this, we call $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ the "major" and "minor" vectors, respectively. To summarize, using the PFA we have decomposed $\mathbf{Z}$ into the sum of the major and minor vectors, such that the minor vector contains weakly dependent entries with heterogeneous variances.

Let σ_i^2 be the variance of the ith entry η_i of the major vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and

$$a_i = \left(1 - \sigma_i^2\right)^{-1/2} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m \tag{9}$$

(with $0^{-1/2} = +\infty$). Then each a_i is the reciprocal of the standard deviation of the ith entry v_i of the minor vector $\mathbf{v}$. The important quantity $a_{(1)} = \min_{1\leq i\leq m} a_i$ measures the speed of PFA, in that larger $a_{(1)}$ indicates faster PFA. Note that $a_{(1)}$ tends to be large when $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ has a few

dominant eigenvalues.

4.2 Estimating the major vector by CPPLS

Now we turn to estimating the major vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}$. Since the mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ contains a proportion π_0 of zero entries and is usually sparse, we estimate $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ by taking $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ as the incidental parameter. Specifically, we consider the following estimate

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^T, \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T\right)^T \in \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathbb{R}^m, \boldsymbol{\xi}\in\mathbb{R}^m}{\arg\min} L\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}; \lambda\right), \tag{10}$$

of $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}^T, \boldsymbol{\eta}^T\right)^T$, where

$$L\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}; \lambda\right) = \left\|\mathbf{Z} - \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\xi}\right\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \rho_\lambda\left(|\beta_i|\right), \tag{11}$$

and $\arg\min$ denotes the set of local minimizers. In (11), the univariate function $\rho_\lambda(\cdot)$ is the *minimax concave penalty* (MCP) in Zhang (2010) with tuning parameter $\lambda > 0$. Specifically, ρ_λ is defined by its derivative as

$$\rho'_\lambda(t) = a^{-1}\left(a\lambda - t\right)_+ 1_{\{t\geq 0\}} \tag{12}$$

with a second tuning parameter $a > 0$, where $(x)_+ = \max\{0, x\}$.

Since the components of $\mathbf{v}$ in model (7) are *weakly dependent and have heterogeneous variances* (WDH), $\rho_\lambda(\cdot)$ is concave, and in (10) only $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ but not $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is penalized, we call (11) a CPPLS with Normal errors that are WDH. This is different than the settings of most penalized linear regression methods where the random errors have identical variances and there are no incidental parameters. We point out that penalizing $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in (11) is to exploit the sparsity of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ so that a more accurate estimate of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ can be obtained and that a local minimizer $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ in (10) is sufficient to construct the consistent estimator of π; see Theorem 1 and Theorem 3. When we implement our consistent estimator of π, we will directly obtain an estimate of the principal factors $\mathbf{w}_k^*$ by an alternating optimization technique from the equivalent formulation of (10) and (11); see Section 4.5 for details.

Let

$$\gamma_m = a_{(1)}^{-1}\sqrt{2\log m} \quad \text{with} \quad a_{(1)} = \min_{1\le i\le m} a_i, \tag{13}$$

where we recall $a_{(1)}^{-1}$ is the maximum of the standard deviations of the v_i's. The quantity $\gamma_m = a_{(1)}^{-1}\sqrt{2\log m}$ is roughly the maximum of the m entries v_i of the minor vector $\mathbf{v}$. We now show the existence of a solution to (10) such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ has the needed property (but not having to be consistent) for the extended FTM to estimate π later in Section 4.3 and Section 4.4.

Theorem 1. *Choose k such that (6) holds. If $\mu^* = \sup_{m\ge 1}\max_{1\le i\le m}|\mu_i|$ is finite, $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\| = O\left(m^{\delta_1}\right)$ and $\gamma_m = O\left(m^{2(\delta_1-1)}\right)$ for some $0<\delta_1<1$, then, with probability approaching to 1 as $m\to\infty$, there exists an estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ from (10) such that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}-\boldsymbol{\eta}\| = O\left(m^{\delta_1}\right)$.*

Since $0<\text{rank}\,(\mathbf{G}_k) = k \le m-1$, Theorem 1 allows us to construct an estimate $\hat{\mathbf{w}}\in\mathbb{R}^k$ of $\mathbf{w}_k^*$ such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \mathbf{G}_k\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ and $\|\mathbf{G}_k\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{G}_k\mathbf{w}_k^*\| = O\left(m^{\delta_1}\right)$. However, Theorem 1 does not say that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ is consistent since only $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}-\boldsymbol{\eta}\| = O\left(m^{\delta_1}\right)$ for some $0<\delta_1<1$ is needed. We briefly comment on the conditions involved in Theorem 1. The requirement that μ^* is finite and $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\| = O\left(m^{\delta_1}\right)$ for some $0<\delta_1<1$ means that the magnitude of the largest nonzero Normal mean does not have to large but it should not decrease to zero very rapidly as $m\to\infty$. This requirement is easily satisfied. The condition $\gamma_m = O\left(m^{2(\delta_1-1)}\right)$ for some $0<\delta_1<1$ means that the maximal noise level induced by entries v_i of the minor vector $\mathbf{v}$ should decrease to zero at appropriate speed as $m\to\infty$. This can be achieved when $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ has a few large eigenvalues of magnitude $O(m)$ or a few dominant eigenvalues; see the types of covariance dependence and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ in Section 5.2.

4.3 Extending the Fourier transform method

Once we are able to control the difference between the estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ of the major vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ (see Theorem 1), it is possible to estimate π from the mean-shifted, estimated minor vector

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}^* = \mathbf{Z} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = (\hat{v}_1^*, \ldots, \hat{v}_m^*)^T, \tag{14}$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{G}_k\hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\hat{\eta}_1, \ldots, \hat{\eta}_m)^T$ is given in Theorem 1. The superior performance of the Fourier transform (FT) based estimator of π in Jin (2008) relies crucially on the assumption that

the Normal random vector has independent or strongly mixing components and that components with zero means have the same variance. However, noticing that v_i, $i = 1, ..., m$ in model (7) are weakly dependent (which is different than being strongly mixing) and have heterogeneous null distributions (i.e., potentially with different variances a_i^{-2} even if their means are zero), we need to extend the FT-based estimator so that it can applied to $\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*$ in (14).

Let $\phi_{\mu,\sigma}(x) = \left(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma\right)^{-1} \exp\left(-2^{-1}\sigma^{-2}(x-\mu)^2\right)$ for $\sigma > 0$. Define

$$\kappa_\sigma(t; x) = \int_{[-1,1]} \omega(\zeta) \exp\left(2^{-1}(t\zeta\sigma)^2\right) \cos(t\zeta x)\, d\zeta, \tag{15}$$

and

$$\psi(t; \mu) = \int_{[-1,1]} \exp\left(\sqrt{-1}t\mu\zeta\right) \omega(\zeta)\, d\zeta \tag{16}$$

for some $\omega(\cdot)$ that is bounded on $[-1, 1]$, symmetric around 0 and Lebesgue integrates to 1. We have $\mathbb{E}[\kappa_\sigma(t, X)] = \psi(t; \mu) = \hat{\omega}(t\mu)$ when $X \sim \mathsf{N}_1(\mu, \sigma^2)$, where $\hat{f}$ denotes the Fourier transform of a Lebesgue integrable function f on $\mathbb{R}$. Obviously, $\psi(t; 0) = 1$ and

$$\mathbb{E}[\kappa_1(t; X)] = (\kappa_1(t; \cdot) * \phi_{0,1})(\mu) = \psi(t; \mu) = \mathbb{E}[\kappa_\sigma(t; X)] = (\kappa_\sigma(t; \cdot) * \phi_{0,\sigma})(\mu),$$

where $*$ denotes the convolution. Further, Lemma 7.1 in Jin (2006) holds for the pair of functions in (15) and (16). Let $v_j^* = \mu_j + v_j$ and $\mathbf{v}^* = (v_1^*, ..., v_m^*)^T$. Then $v_j^* \sim \mathsf{N}_1(\mu_j, a_i^{-2})$. Following Jin (2008), we define the underlying phase function

$$\varphi(t) = \varphi(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}, m) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} [1 - \psi(t; \mu_j)] \tag{17}$$

and empirical phase function

$$\varphi_m(t; \mathbf{v}^*) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left[1 - \kappa_{a_j^{-1}}(t; v_j^*)\right]. \tag{18}$$

We remark that $\kappa_\sigma(\cdot; \cdot)$ and $\varphi_m(\cdot; \cdot)$ generalize corresponding functions in Jin (2008) by allowing for heterogeneous variance a_j^{-2} for each v_j^* since there $\kappa_1(\cdot; \cdot)$ has been used.

The performance of the FT-based estimator hinges upon how accurately φ_m approximates

φ, the oracle that knows the true value π. Specifically, the smaller $\delta_m(t) = |\varphi_m(t;\mathbf{v}^*) - \varphi(t)|$ is, the more accurately $\varphi_m(t;\mathbf{v}^*)$ estimates π. So, we first need to bound $\delta_m(t)$. On the other hand, $\mathbf{v}^*$ is unknown and estimated by $\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*$ in (14). Therefore, we also need to bound $\hat{\delta}_m(t) = |\varphi_m(t;\mathbf{v}^*) - \varphi_m(t;\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*)|$. Through bounds on both $\delta_m(t)$ and $\hat{\delta}_m(t)$, we will be able develop an FT-based estimator under the settings of our model (7). In fact, we have the following:

Theorem 2. *Choose k such that (6) holds. Then, for any $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}^{-2} p_m\left(t, a_{(1)}\right)$,*

$$|\varphi_m(t;\mathbf{v}^*) - \varphi(t)| \leq M\tilde{\epsilon} \int_0^1 \exp\left(2^{-1}t^2\zeta^2 a_{(1)}^{-2}\right) d\zeta, \tag{19}$$

where

$$p_m\left(t, a_{(1)}\right) = t^2 a_{(1)}^{-2} m^{-1} + Mt^2 m^{-\delta} \tag{20}$$

for some finite constant $M > 0$. In particular, when $\sqrt{2\log m} = o\left(a_{(1)}\right)$,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \sup_{0<t\leq\sqrt{2\gamma\log m}} |\varphi_m(t;\mathbf{v}^*) - \varphi(t)| = 0 \tag{21}$$

almost surely for any $\gamma \in (0,1)$.

Theorem 2 bounds $\delta_m(t)$ when the random errors, i.e., v_j's, have heterogeneous variances and are weakly dependent. Therefore, it generalizes the bound on $\delta_m(t)$ in Jin and Cai (2007) and Jin (2008), and we have extended the FT-based estimator to weakly dependent Normal random errors with heterogeneous variances. The proof of Theorem 2 uses a different technique than that in Jin (2008).

With regard to the conditions used in Theorem 2, we have the following remarks: inequality (6) is always achievable by choosing a suitable k as we have pointed out earlier right after Theorem 1; the requirement $\sqrt{2\log m} = o\left(a_{(1)}\right)$ means that the maximal standard deviation $a_{(1)}^{-1}$ of the v_i's should decrease to zero faster than $(2\log m)^{-1/2}$, which is achievable when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ has a few dominant eigenvalues; see the types of covariance dependence and $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ in Section 5.2.

4.4 A consistent estimator of the proportion

We are ready to introduce the new, consistent estimator of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means. When the difference $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|$ (see Theorem 1), the overall speed $a_{(1)}$ of PFA, and the property of the nonzero μ_i's are compatible with each other, the Lipschitz property of κ_σ (defined by (15)) will imply that

$$\varphi_m\left(t; \hat{\mathbf{v}}^*\right) = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left[1 - \kappa_{a_j^{-1}}\left(t; \hat{v}_j^*\right)\right] \tag{22}$$

converges to $\varphi_m\left(t; \mathbf{v}^*\right)$ in probability. In other words, the plug-in estimator $\tilde{\pi} = \varphi_m\left(t; \hat{\mathbf{v}}^*\right)$ will consistently estimate π.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mu_* = \min\{|\mu_i| : |\mu_i| \neq 0\}$. Choose k such that (6) holds and let $\pi \in (0,1)$ be independent of m. If the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold with $0 < \delta_1 < 2^{-1}$, and $\lim_{m\to\infty} \mu_*\sqrt{2\log m} = \infty$, then $\tilde{\pi} = \varphi_m\left(\sqrt{2\gamma\log m}; \hat{\mathbf{v}}^*\right)$ with $\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*$ in (14) and any $\gamma \in (0,1)$ consistently estimates π as $m \to \infty$.*

Theorem 3 provides a consistent estimator $\tilde{\pi}$ of π when the correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ encodes strong dependence but has a few dominant eigenvalues. It induces a consistent estimator of $\pi_0 = 1 - \pi$ as $\tilde{\pi}_0 = 1 - \tilde{\pi}$. Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 show that the consistency of the new estimator $\tilde{\pi}$ does not require that of estimating the major vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, the principal factors $\mathbf{w}_k^*$, or the mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. They also show that, due to the needed speed for the PFA to control the dependence among the entries of the minor vector, the new estimator $\tilde{\pi}$ may not be consistent for π when $\mathbf{Z}$ has an arbitrary pair of mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$.

We briefly discuss the conditions involved in Theorem 3, which contain those used in Theorem 1. The conditions in Theorem 1 are used to obtain an estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ such that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\| = O\left(m^{\delta_1}\right)$ for some $0 < \delta_1 < 2^{-1}$, so that we can apply the extended FTM to the entries of $\hat{\mathbf{v}}^* = \mathbf{Z} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ to estimate π. They are satisfied when $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ has a few eigenvalues of magnitude $O(m)$ or a few dominant eigenvalues as discussed right after Theorem 1; see the types of covariance dependence and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ in Section 5.2. The condition $\lim_{m\to\infty} \mu_*\sqrt{2\log m} = \infty$ simply requires the minimal magnitude of the nonzero Normal means not to be extremely small. This condition is easily satisfied and was also used in Jin and Cai (2007) and Jin (2008), and it is compatible with the conditions in Theorem 1. Finally, the scale of the frequency domain is set as

$\sqrt{2\gamma \log m}$ for the empirical phase function $\varphi_m(t; \hat{\mathbf{v}}^*)$ in (22) as done also in Jin (2008), so that the convergence rate of $\varphi_m(t; \hat{\mathbf{v}}^*)$ compensates the oscillations induced by the noise variables v_i and $\tilde{\pi} = \varphi_m\left(\sqrt{2\gamma \log m}; \hat{\mathbf{v}}^*\right)$ can consistently estimate π for any $\gamma \in (0,1)$. This property of $\tilde{\pi}$ allows to pick any scale from the family $\left\{\sqrt{2\gamma \log m} : \gamma \in (0,1)\right\}$ for the frequency domain in order to consistently estimate π.

4.5 Implementation of the new estimator

In this section, we present the implementation of $\tilde{\pi} = \varphi_m(t; \hat{\mathbf{v}}^*)$. PFA is easily implemented by the spectral decomposition of the correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ and then choosing

$$k_\delta = \min\left\{k : m^{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_{k+1}^2 + ... + \lambda_m^2} \leq m^{-\delta}\right\}$$

with some $\delta \in (0,1)$. We set $\delta = 0.5$ for the simulations in Section 5 and the application in Section 3. After setting up the PFA, we then implement the CPPLS using the MCP in (12) with $a = 3.7$ (see Zhang (2010) for the rationale on choosing $a = 3.7$). Specifically, we solve the equivalent problem

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^T, \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T\right)^T \in \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbf{w}\in\mathbb{R}^k}{\arg\min} L(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}; \lambda)$$

with

$$L(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{w}; \lambda) = \|\mathbf{Z} - \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{G}_k\mathbf{w}\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \rho_\lambda(|\beta_i|)$$

via alternating optimization (e.g., Bezdek and Hathaway; 2002) through the following steps:

1. Set $j = 0$ and initialize $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_*^{(j)} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

2. Use the R package sparsenet of Mazumder et al. (2011) to compute the solution path of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda^{(j)} \in \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathbb{R}^m}{\arg\min} L\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_*^{(j)}; \lambda\right)$ for $\lambda \in S_\lambda = \left\{\tilde{\lambda}_{k^*}, ..., \tilde{\lambda}_0\right\}$, a grid of descendingly ordered λ values automatically set by sparsenet, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda^{(j)}$ has been indexed by $\lambda \in S_\lambda$. Pick $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_*^{(j)}$, $\lambda_*^{(j)}$ for which

$$\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_*^{(j)T}, \lambda_*^{(j)}\right)^T = \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathbb{R}^m, \lambda\in S_\lambda}{\arg\min} L\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_*^{(j)}; \lambda\right).$$

3. Compute $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_*^{(j+1)} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{T}^T\left(\mathbf{z} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_*^{(j)}\right)$, where $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}\left\{\sqrt{\lambda_1}, \cdots, \sqrt{\lambda_k}\right\}$, $\mathbf{T} = (\boldsymbol{\rho_1}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\rho_k})$, and $\mathbf{z}$ is the observation from $\mathbf{Z}$. Note that the λ_i's are the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}_i$'s are their corresponding eigenvectors.

4. Set j to be $j+1$. Repeat steps 2. and 3. until $\left|l^{(j+1)} - l^{(j)}\right| < \tau_*$ with $\tau_* = 10^{-5}$, where $l^{(j)} = L\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*^{(j)}, \mathbf{w}_*^{(j)}; \lambda_*^{(j)}\right)$.

Suppose a local minimizer $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T, \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T\right)$ has been found, we compute $\hat{\mathbf{v}}^* = \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{G}_k\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ as in (14). To implement the last step, i.e., the Fourier transform in (22), for $\tilde{\pi}$, we use the triangular density $\omega(x) = (1 - |x|)\, 1_{\{|x|\leq 1\}}$ and modify the R codes of Jin (2008) to accommodate (17) and (18) since the standard deviations a_j^{-1} of the v_j's are not equal to each other and v_j's are weakly dependent. The modified codes are then applied to the components of $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_*$ to estimate π.

5 Simulation studies

We first describe the estimators of π to be compared and then present the simulation studies. By the duality between π and $\pi_0 = 1-\pi$, we will transform an estimator $\hat{\pi}_0$ of π_0 into $\hat{\pi} = 1-\hat{\pi}_0$, and compare the new estimator $\tilde{\pi}$ with $\hat{\pi}^B = 1 - \hat{\pi}_0^B$ with the median based estimator

$$\hat{\pi}_0^B = (m - [m/2] + 1)\left[m\left(1 - p_{([m/2])}\right)\right]^{-1}$$

in Benjamini et al. (2006), $\hat{\pi}^L = 1 - \hat{\pi}_0^L$ with $\hat{\pi}_0^L$ in Langaas et al. (2005), and $\hat{\pi}^W = 1 - \hat{\pi}_0^W$ with $\hat{\pi}_0^W$ (also called "SLIM") in Wang et al. (2011). It should be noted that $\hat{\pi}^W$ was claimed by its developers to be robust to dependence. Since the estimators $\hat{\pi}^B$, $\hat{\pi}^L$ and $\hat{\pi}^W$ are based on p-values, we will convert each observed Normal random variable z_i into $p_i = 1 - \Phi(|z_i|)$ and apply each of these estimators to the m p-values to estimate π, where Φ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard Normal random variable $\mathsf{N}_1(0, 1)$.

5.1 Simulation setup

We will choose 5 values of π, and for each value of π simulate 5 types of covariance dependence and 5 levels of minimal signal strength. Set $m = 2000$. For each $\pi \in \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$ and

$\mu_* \in \{3, 2, 1.5, 1, 0.45\}$, execute the following:

Step 1. Set $m_0 = m(1-\pi)$ and $m_1 = m\pi$. For the mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, set $\mu_j = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq m_0$ but generate $|\mu_j|$ for $m_0 + 1 \leq j \leq m$ independently from the uniform distribution on $[\mu_*, \mu_* + 1]$. The signs of μ_j for $m_0 + 1 \leq j \leq m$ are generated from m_1 independent Bernoulli random variables each taking values ± 1 with equal probability.

Step 2. Generate $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, ..., \varepsilon_{m+3})^T$ whose entries are $m+3$ i.i.d. realizations of the standard Normal random variable.

Step 3. Pick one of the 5 types of covariance dependence:

- Block: set $Z_i^* = \varepsilon_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq 0.95m$ but $Z_i^* = \sum_{j=1}^{c_0} (-1)^{j+1} 0.2\varepsilon_j + \sqrt{1 - 0.2^2 c_0}\varepsilon_i$ with $c_0 = 0.01m$ for $0.95m + 1 \leq i \leq m$. The corresponding correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is not block diagonal but has three blocks of size 100 of dependent Z_i^*'s, one in the upper right, the other the lower left, and the third the lower right, where some correlations are strong.
- Equal correlation ("Equal Corr."): set $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \rho\mathbf{I} + (1-\rho)\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T$ with $\rho = 0.5$ and generate $\mathbf{Z}^* \sim \mathsf{N}_m(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is a column vector of 1's.
- Three factors ("3 Factors"): $Z_i^* = -0.25\varepsilon_1 + 0.2\varepsilon_2 - 0.125\varepsilon_3 + \varepsilon_{i+3}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. The correlation between Z_i^* and Z_j^* for $i \neq j$ is $4^{-2} + 5^{-2} + 8^{-2} \approx 0.118$, i.e., the Z_i^*'s are equally correlated but the equal correlations are generated by 3 factors ε_1, ε_2 and ε_3.
- Two components ("Two Comp."): set $Z_1^* = \varepsilon_1$, $Z_i^* = 2^{-1/2}(-\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_i)$ for $2 \leq i \leq m$. The correlation between Z_1^* and Z_i^* for $i \neq 1$ is $2^{-1/2}$, and that between Z_i^* and Z_j^* for $i, j > 1$ and $i \neq j$ is 0.5. The corresponding correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ has two components, one for equal correlation $2^{-1/2}$ and the other for equal correlation 0.5.
- Unstructured: generate a $m \times 4$ matrix $\mathbf{Q}$ of i.i.d. observations from the standard Normal random variable, compute the sample correlation matrix $\mathbf{H}$ of $\mathbf{Q}$, and set $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = 0.4\mathbf{H} + 0.6\mathbf{I}$. There is no structure for the correlations among the $\mathbf{Z}^*$'s when they have correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$.

Step 4. Set $\mathbf{Z}^* = (Z_1^*, ..., Z_m^*)^T$ and $\mathbf{Z} = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{Z}^*$, for which $\mathbf{Z}$ has correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$; generate an observation $\mathbf{z}$ from $\mathbf{Z}$ and apply each of the four estimators $\tilde{\pi}$, $\hat{\pi}^B$, $\hat{\pi}^L$ and $\hat{\pi}^W$ to estimate π based on $\mathbf{z}$.

Step 5. Repeat Steps 1. to 4. 100 times.

We refer to "Block", "Equal correlation", "Three factors" and "Two components" as "structured covariance dependence". Each of the three types of dependence, "Equal correlation", "Three factors" and "Two components", represents long range dependence which is neither weak dependence nor strong mixing. So, these are types of strong but structured covariance dependence for components of a Normal random vector. The "Unstructured" dependence can induce long range dependence too. For each of the structured covariance dependence, the corresponding $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ has one dominant eigenvalue; see Figure 2 for the 20 largest eigenvalues for each type of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$.



Figure 2: The 20 largest eigenvalues of the correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ for each type of dependence. For each structured covariance dependence, the corresponding correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ has one dominant eigenvalue, whereas for "Unstructured" covariance dependence $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ has 4 dominant eigenvalues.

5.2 Summary for simulation results

An estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means is said to be better if it is no larger than π (in order to maintain conservative FDR control or estimation) and has smaller bias and standard deviation (i.e., is more accurate and stable). Recall that μ_* is the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero means, i.e., the minimal signal strength. For $\mu_* = 3$, Figure 3 visualizes the performances of the estimators of π and Table 1 records the biases and *sample standard deviations* (std dev) of these estimators. They show that the new estimator $\tilde{\pi}$ is the best for structured covariance dependence. Results for $\mu_* \in \{2, 1.5, 1, 0.45\}$ are given in the supplementary material. We omit reporting the performance of $\hat{\pi}^L$ since it is always close to 1.

For structured covariance dependence, the following are observed: (i) the new estimator $\tilde{\pi}$ is the best when the minimal signal strength is relatively large; (ii) it is also the best when $\pi < 0.4$ regardless of the minimal signal strength; (iii) it always has the smallest variance. For unstructured covariance dependence, the following are observed: (i) the new estimator tends to be more accurate as the minimal signal strength becomes smaller when π is not large; (ii) it is the best when the minimal signal strength is small and $\pi \leq 0.3$; (iii) it is the best when all combinations of values of π and the minimal signal strength are considered; see Figure 3 and the figures in the supplementary material. These observations suggest that the new estimator can be safely applied to estimate π in applications where our problem setup is appropriate (see the examples in Section 2 and Section 3), the proportion of nonzero Normal means $\pi \leq 0.3$, and the correlation matrix of the test statistics is approximately structured with a few dominating eigenvalues.

Finally, the SLIM estimator $\hat{\pi}^W$ and the median based estimator $\hat{\pi}^B$ usually have relatively large variance when the covariance dependence is "Equal correlation" or "Two components". For structured covariance dependence, when $\pi \geq 0.4$ but $\mu_* \leq 1$, i.e., when the signals are dense and relatively weak, the median based estimator $\hat{\pi}^B$ is more accurate than the new estimator. This is likely because in this case more information on the distribution of nonzero Normal means is available to $\hat{\pi}^B$. For unstructured covariance dependence, when $\mu_* \geq 2$ but $\pi \leq 0.3$, the SLIM estimator $\hat{\pi}^W$ is slightly more accurate than the new estimator; see Table 1 and the tables in the supplementary material. This is likely because in this case the SLIM estimator better utilizes

the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the p-values since it is based on the quantiles of local estimates of π obtained from different parts of such a CDF.



Figure 3: The excess $d(\hat{\pi}) = \hat{\pi} - \pi$ of an estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 3$, where the dashed line marks $\hat{\pi} = \pi$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive excess and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best.

		Bias			Std Dev		
		Benjamini	New	SLIM	Benjamini	New	SLIM
Block	$\pi = 0.1$	0.25596	-0.0030166	0.061457	0.004794	0.011244	0.02679
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.18357	-0.0039275	0.040868	0.004941	0.010976	0.02324
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.11486	-0.0054009	0.029470	0.003895	0.010209	0.01943
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.05051	-0.0057885	0.012503	0.003202	0.009552	0.01619
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.01558	-0.0070828	0.006517	0.001575	0.009948	0.01503
Equal Corr.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.24873	-0.0007765	0.051670	0.055512	0.004958	0.07836
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.17267	-0.0016526	0.033969	0.049102	0.004933	0.06953
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.10052	-0.0030615	0.022090	0.040617	0.004321	0.05733
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.03526	-0.0040539	0.014974	0.027338	0.004237	0.04356
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.01813	-0.0051752	0.008714	0.002569	0.003711	0.03332
3 Factors	$\pi = 0.1$	0.25553	-0.0002324	0.058420	0.013090	0.008719	0.03000
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.18261	-0.0005969	0.040527	0.012133	0.008399	0.02878
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.11361	-0.0019539	0.029154	0.009903	0.007921	0.02341
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.04898	-0.0033888	0.019038	0.006551	0.007873	0.01969
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.01617	-0.0052064	0.008945	0.001535	0.007080	0.01509
Two Comp.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.24870	-0.0005933	0.053347	0.055771	0.004695	0.07483
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.17245	-0.0019353	0.034035	0.049453	0.004394	0.06772
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.10041	-0.0024518	0.022508	0.040502	0.004414	0.05448
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.03490	-0.0039782	0.010536	0.027430	0.003828	0.04582
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.01810	-0.0052380	0.003586	0.002730	0.003735	0.03563
Unstructured	$\pi = 0.1$	0.25444	0.0897267	0.049023	0.023004	0.050224	0.04321
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.18125	0.0757672	0.038145	0.020739	0.042348	0.03765
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.11149	0.0639421	0.025340	0.018255	0.036052	0.03251
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.04690	0.0507392	0.017732	0.012268	0.029720	0.02373
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.01668	0.0359593	0.004582	0.001856	0.021465	0.02174

Table 1: Bias and sample standard deviation (std dev) of estimators of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 3$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive bias and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best.

6 Discussion

For multiple testing which components of a Normal random vector have zero means, we have developed a consistent estimator of the proportion of nonzero Normal means when the components can be strongly dependent and their correlation matrix has a few dominating eigenvalues. The new estimator is accurate and stable. It can be applied to multiple testing related to marginal regression analysis for high-dimensional data where the random errors are Normally distributed.

In order to develop this estimator, we have established the existence and property of a concave partially penalized least squares (CPPLS) estimate with weakly dependent, heterogenous Normal random errors in the presence of incidental parameters. We have also extended the Fourier transform method to estimate this proportion in Jin (2008) to the case of weakly dependent Normal random errors that have heterogeneous variances. Our results on the CPPLS estimate of the principal factors can be strengthened to provide an alternative to several strategies for adjusting for dependence in multiple testing. These include the method in Friguet et al. (2009) to estimate the factors by the expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm (Dempster et al.; 1977), that in Fan, Han and Gu (2012) to estimate the principal factors by L_1-regression under the assumption $\pi \approx 0$, and that in Desai and Storey (2012) to estimate the shared variation by ridge-type shrinkage. Our extension of the FTM of Jin (2008) is nontrivial since the Normal random errors have heterogenous variances and are weakly dependent. Accordingly, we have used a general technique to derive the bounds on the difference between the phase function and its estimate.

We point out that it may still be possible to consistently estimate the proportion of nonzero Normal means when the correlation matrix of the Normal random vector is unknown but not accurately estimated. Note that π is invariant under any permutation of the indices of the means that keeps π unchanged and that it is invariant under nonzero scaling of the means. Since a permutation corresponds to an orthogonal matrix and a nonzero scaling to a nonsingular diagonal matrix, the two invariant properties of π imply that the estimation of π is quite robust to the inaccuracy in estimating the factors (or major vector), the means and the correlation/covariance matrix. We leave the exploration along this line to future research.

7 Supplementary material

We provide the proofs of Theorem 1, Theorem 2, and Theorem 3, and additional simulation results for the new estimator under different minimal signal strengths of the nonzero Normal means.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded in part by a National Science Foundation Plant Genome Research Program grant (No. IOS-1025976) to R.W. Doerge, and it produced the technical report Chen and Doerge (2012). The authors would like to thank Philip T. Reiss and Armin Schwartzman for providing the brain imaging data set and R codes used for the analysis in Azriel and Schwartzman (2015), Jiashun Jin for providing the technical report Jin (2006), Jianqing Fan for helpful pointers, and Runlong Tang for sharing the manuscript Fan, Tang and Shi (2012).

References

Azriel, D. and Schwartzman, A. (2015). The empirical distribution of a large number of correlated normal variables, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **110**(511): 1217–1228.

Benjamini, Y., Krieger, A. M. and Yekutieli, D. (2006). Adaptive linear step-up procedures that control the false discovery rate, *Biometrika* **93**(3): 491–507.

Benjamini, Y. and Yekutieli, D. (2001). The control of the false discovery rate in mutliple testing under dependency, *Ann. Statist.* **29**(4): 1165–1188.

Bezdek, J. C. and Hathaway, R. J. (2002). Some notes on alternating optimization, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* pp. 187–195.

Blanchard, G. and Roquain, E. (2009). Adaptive false discovery rate control under independence and dependence, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **10**: 2837–2871.

Chen, X. and Doerge, R. (2012). Estimating the proportion of nonzero normal means under certain strong covariance dependence, *Technical report. Department of statistics, Purdue University, West Lafayette* .

Dempster, A. P., Laird, N. M. and Rubin, D. B. (1977). Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the em algorithm, *J. R. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **39**(1): 1–38.

Desai, K. H. and Storey, J. D. (2012). Cross-dimensional inference of dependent high-dimensional data, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **107**(497): 135–151.

Efron, B., Tibshirani, R., Storey, J. D. and Tusher, V. (2001). Empirical bayes analysis of a microarray experiment, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **96**(456): 1151–1160.

Fan, J., Han, X. and Gu, W. (2012). Estimating false discovery proportion under arbitrary covariance dependence, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **107**(499): 1019–1035.

Fan, J., Tang, R. and Shi, X. (2012). Partial consistency with sparse incidental parameters, *arxiv.org/pdf/1210.6950* .

Friguet, C., Kloareg, M. and Causeur, D. (2009). A factor model approach to multiple testing under dependence, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **104**(488): 1406–1415.

Jin, J. (2006). Propotions of nonzero normal means: universal oracle equivalence and uniformly consistent estimations, *Technical report. Department of statistics, Purdue University, West Lafayette* .

Jin, J. (2008). Proportion of non-zero normal means: universal oracle equivalences and uniformly consistent estimators, *J. R. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **70**(3): 461–493.

Jin, J. and Cai, T. T. (2007). Estimating the null and the proportion of nonnull effects in large-scale multiple comparisons, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **102**(478): 495–506.

Klebanov, L. and Yakovlev, A. (2007). Diverse correlation structures in gene expression data and their utility in improving statistical inference, *Ann. Statist.* **1**(2): 538–559.

Langaas, M., Henery, L. B. and Ferkingstad, E. (2005). Estimating the proportion of true null hypotheses, with application to dna microarray data, *J. R. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **67**(4): 555–572.

Leek, J. T. and Storey, J. D. (2008). A general framework for multiple testing dependence, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **105**(48): 18718–18723.

Lyons, R. (1988). Strong laws of large numbers for weakly correlated random variables, *The Michigan Mathematical Journal* **35**: 353–359.

Mazumder, R., Friedman, J. H. and Hastie, T. (2011). parsenet: Coordinate descent with nonconvex penalties, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **106**(495): 1125–1138.

Owen, A. B. (2005). Variance of the number of false discoveries, **67**(3): 411–426.

Ploner, A., Calza, S., Gusnanto, A. and Pawitan, Y. (2006). Multidimensional local false discovery rate for microarray studies, *Bioinformatics* **22**(5): 556–565.

Proal, E., Reiss, P. T., Klein, R. G. and et al (2011). Brain gray matter deficits at 33-year follow-up in adults with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder established in childhood, *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* **68**(11): 1122–1134.

Storey, J. (2003). The positive false discovery rate: a Bayesian intepretation and the q-value, *Ann. Statist.* **3**(6): 2013–2035.

Storey, J. D. (2002). A direct approach to false discovery rates, *J. R. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **64**(3): 479–498.

Storey, J. D., Taylor, J. E. and Siegmund, D. (2004). Strong control, conservative point estimation in simultaneous conservative consistency of false discover rates: a unified approach, *J. R. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **66**(1): 187–205.

Wang, H.-Q., Tuominen, L. K. and Tsai, C.-J. (2011). SLIM: A sliding linear model for estimating the proportion of true null hypotheses in datasets with dependence structures, *Bioinformatics* **27**: 225–231.

Zhang, C.-H. (2010). Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty, *Ann. Statist.* **38**(2): 894–942.

Supplement for "A consistent estimator of the proportion of nonzero Normal means under certain strong covariance dependence"

Xiongzhi Chen* and Rebecca W. Doerge†

Abstract

We provide the proofs of Theorem 1, Theorem 2, and Theorem 3, and additional simulation results for the new estimator under different minimal signal strengths of the nonzero Normal means.

A Proofs

In the proofs, $\mathbb{P}$ denotes the probability measure, $\mathbb{E}$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}$, "$\mathbb{P}$-a.s." means "almost surely in $\mathbb{P}$", and cov and var are the covariance and variance operator with respect to $\mathbb{P}$, respectively. Further, $O_{\mathbb{P}}$ and $o_{\mathbb{P}}$ are the probabilistic versions of the "big O" and "small o" notations, respectively. Finally, M denotes a generic, positive constant whose values can vary at different occurrences. We will use the same notations and settings in the main paper, and all asymptotics are for when $m \to \infty$.

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Let sgn be the sign function. It is easy to see that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = (\hat{\mu}_1, ..., \hat{\mu}_m)^T$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = (\hat{\eta}_1, ..., \hat{\eta}_m)^T$ necessarily satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\eta}_i = Z_i - \hat{\mu}_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m, \\ 2\left(\hat{\mu}_i + \hat{\eta}_i - Z_i\right) + \rho'_\lambda\left(|\hat{\mu}_i|\right) \operatorname{sgn}\left(\hat{\mu}_i\right) = 0 \text{ if } \hat{\mu}_i \neq 0, \\ -2^{-1}\lambda \leq \hat{\mu}_i + \hat{\eta}_i - Z_i \leq 2^{-1}\lambda \text{ if } \hat{\mu}_i = 0. \end{cases}$$

*Corresponding author. Center for Statistics and Machine Learning and Lewis-Sigler Institute, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA; E-mail: xiongzhi@princeton.edu.

†Department of Statistics and Department of Agronomy, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA; E-mail: doerge@purdue.edu.

Let $\hat{I}_0 = \{1 \leq i \leq m : \hat{\mu}_i = 0\}$ and $\hat{I}_1 = \{1, ..., m\} \setminus \hat{I}_0$. Then $\hat{\eta}_i = Z_i$ and $\hat{\eta}_i - \eta_i = \mu_i + v_i$ for $i \in \hat{I}_0$ whereas $\hat{\eta}_i = Z_i - \hat{\mu}_i$ and $|\hat{\mu}_i| \geq a\lambda$ for $i \in \hat{I}_1$. Therefore,

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2 = \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_0} (\mu_i + v_i)^2 + \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_1} (\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_i + v_i)^2 . \tag{A.1}$$

It is left to pick $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $a\lambda$ such that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\| = O\left(m^{\delta_1}\right)$.

Let $E_1 = \{\max_{1 \leq i \leq m} |v_i| \leq \gamma_m\}$, where we recall that v_i's are components of $\mathbf{v}$. Note $\lim_{m \to \infty} a_{(1)}\gamma_m = \lim_{m \to \infty} \sqrt{2 \log m} = \infty$. By Mill's ratio,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_1^C\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{a_i |v_i| > a_{(1)}\gamma_m\right\}\right) \leq (2 \log m)^{-1/2} + o(1) .$$

So, $\mathbb{P}(E_1) = 1 + o(1)$. Hereunder, we condition our arguments on the event E_1 and do not mention this explicitly when a proposition holds *with probability approaching to* 1 (abbreviated as "wpa-1").

Set $|\hat{\mu}_i| = a\lambda$ for $i \in \hat{I}_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_1} (\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_i + v_i)^2 \\
\leq & \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_1} (\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_i)^2 + \left|\hat{I}_1\right| \gamma_m^2 + 2 \sum_{i,j \in \hat{I}_1; i \neq j} |\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_i| \gamma_m \\
\leq & \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_1} \mu_i^2 + 2a\lambda \sum_{i,j \in \hat{I}_1; i \neq j} |\mu_i| + \left|\hat{I}_1\right| a^2\lambda^2 + \left|\hat{I}_1\right|^2 (a\lambda + \mu^*) \gamma_m + \left|\hat{I}_1\right| \gamma_m^2 \\
\leq & \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_1} \mu_i^2 + a\lambda \left|\hat{I}_1\right|^2 \mu^* + \left|\hat{I}_1\right| a^2\lambda^2 + \left|\hat{I}_1\right|^2 (a\lambda + \mu^*) \gamma_m + \left|\hat{I}_1\right| \gamma_m^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in \hat{I}_0} (\mu_i + v_i)^2 & \leq \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_0} \mu_i^2 + 2\gamma_m \sum_{i,j \in \hat{I}_1; i \neq j} |\mu_i| + \left|\hat{I}_1\right| \gamma_m^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_0} \mu_i^2 + \gamma_m \left|\hat{I}_0\right|^2 \mu^* + \left|\hat{I}_0\right| \gamma_m^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Definitely, we can set $\hat{I}_1$ and $a\lambda$ such that $\left|\hat{I}_1\right| \geq 1$, $\lim_{m \to \infty} a\lambda = 0$ but $a\lambda \left|\hat{I}_1\right|^2 = O\left(m^{2\delta_1}\right)$. This,

with the finiteness of μ^*, implies

$$\sum_{i\in\hat{I}_1}(\mu_i-\hat{\mu}_i+v_i)^2=\sum_{i\in\hat{I}_1}\mu_i^2+O\left(m^{2\delta_1}\right)+\left|\hat{I}_1\right|\gamma_m^2+O\left(\left|\hat{I}_1\right|^2\gamma_m\right).$$

Similarly, we can set $\hat{I}_0$ such that $\left|\hat{I}_0\right|\geq 1$ and

$$\sum_{i\in\hat{I}_0}(\mu_i+v_i)^2\leq\sum_{i\in\hat{I}_0}\mu_i^2+\left|\hat{I}_0\right|\gamma_m^2+O\left(\left|\hat{I}_0\right|^2\gamma_m\right).$$

With the above choice of $\hat{I}_0$, $\hat{I}_1$ and $a\lambda$, we obtain

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}-\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2=\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2+O\left(m^{2\delta_1}\right)+O\left(m\gamma_m^2\right)+O\left(m^2\gamma_m\right).$$

By the assumptions on $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and γ_m, we have $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}-\boldsymbol{\eta}\|=O\left(m^{\delta_1}\right)$. The proof is completed.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Pick a $\zeta\in[-1,1]$. Let $\tilde{s}_m(t)=m^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\cos\left(t\zeta v_j^*\right)$, $\tilde{s}(t)=\mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{s}_m(t)\right]$ and $d_{E,m}=\tilde{s}_m(t)-\tilde{s}(t)$. Then, $\operatorname{var}\left[d_{E,m}\right]=I_1+I_2$ with $I_1=m^{-2}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\operatorname{var}\left[\cos\left(t\zeta v_j^*\right)\right]$ and $I_2=2m^{-2}\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq m}\tilde{c}_{ij}$, where

$$\tilde{c}_{ij}=\operatorname{cov}\left[\cos\left(t\zeta v_i^*\right),\cos\left(t\zeta v_j^*\right)\right].$$

Define $A_m(t)=\left\{t:0<t\leq\sqrt{2\gamma\log m}\right\}$. Given $\tilde{\epsilon}>0$, our strategy has two steps: (a) derive a general bound on $\operatorname{var}\left[d_{E,m}\right]$ to deduce (19), i.e.

$$\left|\varphi_m\left(t;\mathbf{v}^*\right)-\varphi(t)\right|\leq M\tilde{\epsilon}\int_0^1\exp\left(2^{-1}t^2\zeta^2a_{(1)}^{-2}\right)d\zeta;$$

(b) with

$$t\in A_m(t)\ \text{ and }\ \sqrt{2\log m}=o\left(a_{(1)}\right), \tag{A.2}$$

show $\text{var}\left[d_{E,m}\right] = O\left(m^{-\hat{\delta}}\right)$ for some $0 < \hat{\delta} < \delta$, which invokes Theorem 6 of Lyons (1988), a strong law of large numbers (SLLN) for weakly dependent random variables, to imply

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} d_{E,m} = 0, \ \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{A.3}$$

Let $\chi_i = \exp\left(\sqrt{-1}t\zeta v_i^*\right)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since $v_i + v_j$ is Normally distributed as $\mathsf{N}_1\left(0, \tilde{a}_{ij}\right)$ with mean 0 and variance $\tilde{a}_{ij} = a_i^{-2} + a_j^{-2} + 2c_{ij}$ for $i \neq j$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\chi_i\chi_j\right] = \exp\left(\sqrt{-1}t\zeta\left(u_i + u_j\right)\right)\exp\left(-2^{-1}t^2\zeta^2\tilde{a}_{ij}\right),$$

where we recall $c_{ij} = \text{cov}\left(v_i, v_j\right)$ when $i \neq j$. Therefore,

$$\text{cov}\left[\chi_i, \chi_j\right] = \exp\left(\sqrt{-1}t\zeta\left(u_i + u_j\right)\right)g_{ij}$$

with

$$g_{ij} = \exp\left(-2^{-1}t^2\zeta^2\left(a_i^{-2} + a_j^{-2}\right)\right)\left(\exp\left(-t^2\zeta^2 c_{ij}\right) - 1\right).$$

Similarly, since $v_i - v_j$ is Normally distributed as $\mathsf{N}_1\left(0, \hat{a}_{ij}\right)$ with $\hat{a}_{ij} = a_i^{-2} + a_j^{-2} - 2c_{ij}$ for $i \neq j$, we have

$$\text{cov}\left[\chi_i, \overline{\chi_j}\right] = \exp\left(\sqrt{-1}t\zeta\left(u_i - u_j\right)\right)\hat{g}_{ij}$$

with

$$\hat{g}_{ij} = \exp\left(-2^{-1}t^2\zeta^2\left(a_i^{-2} + a_j^{-2}\right)\right)\left(\exp\left(t^2\zeta^2 c_{ij}\right) - 1\right),$$

where $\overline{\chi_j}$ is the complex conjugate of χ_j. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{c}_{ij} &= 2^{-1}\left[\Re\left(\text{cov}\left[\chi_i, \chi_j\right]\right) + \Re\left(\text{cov}\left[\chi_i, \overline{\chi_j}\right]\right)\right] \\
&= 2^{-1}\left\{\cos\left[t\zeta\left(u_i + u_j\right)\right]g_{ij} + \cos\left[t\zeta\left(u_i - u_j\right)\right]\hat{g}_{ij}\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Re\left(\cdot\right)$ denotes the real part.

From

$$\left|\exp\left(\pm t^2\zeta^2 c_{ij}\right) - 1\right| \leq t^2\zeta^2 \left|c_{ij}\right| \exp\left(t^2\zeta^2 \hat{c}_{ij}\right) \leq t^2\zeta^2 \left|c_{ij}\right| \exp\left(t^2\zeta^2 a_{(1)}^{-2}\right)$$

for some $\hat{c}_{ij}$ that is strictly between 0 and $\pm c_{ij}$, we see that, for each fixed t and ζ,

$$\left|\tilde{c}_{ij}\right| = \exp\left(-t^2\zeta^2 a_{(1)}^{-2}\right)\left|\exp\left(-t^2\zeta^2 c_{ij}\right) - 1\right| \leq t^2\zeta^2 \left|c_{ij}\right|.$$

Therefore,

$$|I_2| \leq Mt^2\zeta^2 m^{-2} \sum_{1\leq i<j\leq m} |c_{ij}| \leq Mt^2 m^{-\delta},$$

for some constant $M > 0$, where we have used (6) and (8) (i.e., the components of the minor vector are weakly dependent). On the other hand, $\cos\left(t\zeta v_i^*\right) = \cos\left(t\zeta\mu_i\right) - t\zeta v_i \sin\left(t\zeta\tilde{v}_i^*\right)$ for some $\tilde{v}_i^*$ strictly between μ_i and v_i^*, and

$$\text{var}\left[\cos\left(t\zeta v_i^*\right)\right] = t^2\zeta^2 \text{var}\left[v_i \sin\left(t\zeta\tilde{v}_i^*\right)\right] \leq t^2\zeta^2 \mathbb{E}\left[v_i^2\right] = t^2\zeta^2 a_i^{-2}.$$

So,

$$I_1 \leq m^{-1} \max_{1\leq i\leq m} \text{var}\left[\cos\left(t\zeta v_i^*\right)\right] = t^2 a_{(1)}^{-2} m^{-1}.$$

Hence, $\text{var}\left[d_{E,m}\right] \leq p_m\left(t, a_{(1)}\right)$ and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\left|d_{E,n}\right| > \tilde{\varepsilon}\right\}\right) \leq \frac{\text{var}\left[d_{E,m}\right]}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2} \leq \frac{p_m\left(t, a_{(1)}\right)}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2},$$

where $p_m\left(t, a_{(1)}\right)$ is defined by (20), i.e.,

$$p_m\left(t, a_{(1)}\right) = t^2 a_{(1)}^{-2} m^{-1} + Mt^2 m^{-\delta}.$$

From

$$\left|\varphi_m\left(t; \mathbf{v}^*\right) - \varphi\left(t\right)\right| \leq 2\int_0^1 \exp\left(2^{-1}t^2\zeta^2 a_{(1)}^{-2}\right)\left|\omega\left(\zeta\right)\right|\left|\tilde{s}_m\left(t\right) - \tilde{s}\left(t\right)\right| d\zeta,$$

we see that (19), i.e.,

$$|\varphi_m(t;\mathbf{v}^*)-\varphi(t)| \le M\tilde{\epsilon}\int_0^1 \exp\left(2^{-1}t^2\zeta^2 a_{(1)}^{-2}\right)d\zeta;$$

holds with probability at least $1-\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-2}p_m\left(t,a_{(1)}\right)$. Finally, when (A.2) holds, we have

$$\sup_{(t,\zeta)\in\left[0,\sqrt{2\log m}\right]\times[-1,1]} p_m\left(t,a_{(1)}\right) = O\left(m^{-\hat{\delta}}\right)$$

for any $0<\hat{\delta}<\delta$, which implies (A.3). Further, (A.2) implies

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\sup_{(\gamma,\zeta)\in[0,1]\times[-1,1]} \gamma\zeta^2 a_{(1)}^{-2}\log m = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\int_0^1 \exp\left(\gamma\zeta^2 a_{(1)}^{-2}\log m\right)d\zeta = 1,$$

where we have used the *dominated convergence theorem* (DCT). Thus, (21), i.e.,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\sup_{0<t\le\sqrt{2\gamma\log m}} |\varphi_m(t;\mathbf{v}^*)-\varphi(t)| = 0$$

holds almost surely for any $\gamma\in(0,1)$. This completes the proof.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Let $I_1^*=\{j:|\mu_j|>0\}$. Let $t^*=\sqrt{2\gamma\log m}$. By the decomposition $\varphi_m(t^*;\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*)-\pi = r_1+r_2+r_3$, where $r_1=\varphi_m(t^*;\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*)-\varphi_m(t^*;\mathbf{v}^*)$, $r_2=\varphi_m(t^*;\mathbf{v}^*)-\varphi(t^*)$ and $r_3=\varphi(t^*)-\pi$, we see that, to show $\varphi_m(t^*;\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*)-\pi$ converges to zero in probability, it suffices to show $r_i=o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ for $i=1,2,3$.

First, $|t^*\mu_j|\ge|t^*\mu_*|\to\infty$ for $j\in I_1^*$ and $\lim_{t^*\to\infty}\varphi(t^*)=\pi$, which implies $r_3=o(1)$. Secondly, since $m^2\gamma_m=O\left(m^{2\delta_1}\right)$ for $0<\delta_1<2^{-1}$ implies $\sqrt{2\log m}=o\left(a_{(1)}\right)$, Theorem 2 implies

$$|r_2|\le\sup_{0\le t\le t^*}\left|\pi^{-1}\left[\varphi_m(t;\mathbf{v}^*)-\varphi(t)\right]\right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Therefore, it is left to show $r_1=o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$.

Clearly,

$$|r_1| \leq m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int_{-1}^{1} |\omega(\zeta)| \exp\left(2^{-1}\left(t^* \zeta a_{(1)}^{-1}\right)^2\right) t^* \left|\zeta\left(v_j^* - \hat{v}_j^*\right) \sin\left(t^* \zeta \tilde{v}_j^*\right)\right| d\zeta$$

for some $\tilde{v}_j^*$ strictly between v_j^* and $\hat{v}_j^*$. Therefore, for some constant $M > 0$,

$$|r_1| \leq M t^* m^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left|v_j^* - \hat{v}_j^*\right| \leq M t^* m^{-1/2} \left\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\right\|.$$

Since the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold with $0 < \delta_1 < 2^{-1}$, we have

$$t^* m^{-1/2} \left\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\right\| \leq M m^{-1/2} m^{\delta_1} \sqrt{2 \log m} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Thus, $r_1 = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and the new estimator is consistent. This completes the proof.

B Simulation results when minimal signal strength is 2



Figure B.1: The excess $d(\hat{\pi}) = \hat{\pi} - \pi$ of an estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 2$, where the dashed line marks $\hat{\pi} = \pi$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive excess and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best.

		Bias			Std Dev		
		Benjamini	New	SLIM	Benjamini	New	SLIM
Block	$\pi = 0.1$	0.25419	-0.014123	0.0473018	0.004791	0.011922	0.02906
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.17846	-0.023529	0.0104083	0.004862	0.012706	0.02618
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.10534	-0.031114	-0.0253431	0.004397	0.012091	0.02369
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.03299	-0.040947	-0.0540270	0.003688	0.011331	0.02334
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.04141	-0.051469	-0.0796037	0.003476	0.013769	0.01770
Equal Corr.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.24728	-0.007783	0.0414034	0.054264	0.005273	0.07092
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.16896	-0.017141	-0.0024242	0.046204	0.005294	0.06306
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.09378	-0.026396	-0.0298384	0.036331	0.005103	0.04441
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.02339	-0.034508	-0.0560876	0.023223	0.005540	0.02979
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.04453	-0.042546	-0.0805302	0.006821	0.005016	0.01912
Three Factors	$\pi = 0.1$	0.25377	-0.007472	0.0449588	0.012572	0.008664	0.02873
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.17780	-0.015670	0.0073633	0.010953	0.008519	0.02546
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.10435	-0.024700	-0.0247023	0.008860	0.008035	0.02460
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.03239	-0.033361	-0.0536669	0.005573	0.008583	0.02071
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.04252	-0.045129	-0.0808634	0.003026	0.008066	0.01689
Two Comp.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.24726	-0.007399	0.0426443	0.054458	0.004820	0.06928
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.16894	-0.016524	0.0006644	0.046675	0.005052	0.05951
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.09401	-0.025075	-0.0303219	0.036513	0.005015	0.04602
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.02321	-0.034048	-0.0562381	0.023041	0.004737	0.03104
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.04563	-0.043493	-0.0845221	0.007394	0.004882	0.01881
Unstructured	$\pi = 0.1$	0.25261	0.078054	0.0402548	0.022265	0.048054	0.03827
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.17663	0.054929	0.0032062	0.019681	0.039897	0.03298
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.10342	0.030467	-0.0279321	0.015767	0.031933	0.03103
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.03094	0.006424	-0.0547324	0.010271	0.024221	0.02262
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.04300	-0.020007	-0.0798758	0.004244	0.014929	0.01842

Table B.1: Bias and sample standard deviation (std dev) of estimators of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 2$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive bias and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best.

C Simulation results when minimal signal strength is 1.5



Figure C.1: The excess $d(\hat{\pi}) = \hat{\pi} - \pi$ of an estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 1.5$, where the dashed line marks $\hat{\pi} = \pi$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive excess and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best.

		Bias			Std Dev		
		Benjamini	New	SLIM	Benjamini	New	SLIM
Block	$\pi = 0.1$	0.251239	-0.02859	0.03061	0.005244	0.012226	0.02780
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.171458	-0.05259	-0.02855	0.005536	0.011961	0.02461
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.093704	-0.07496	-0.07159	0.004831	0.012025	0.02345
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.015120	-0.10247	-0.12107	0.004615	0.011275	0.02177
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.062935	-0.12464	-0.16016	0.004301	0.012714	0.01912
Equal Corr.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.245220	-0.02272	0.03848	0.053462	0.005501	0.06705
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.163943	-0.04790	-0.03300	0.044930	0.005671	0.06405
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.084956	-0.07289	-0.07837	0.035441	0.005697	0.05238
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.008581	-0.09584	-0.12486	0.024455	0.006716	0.04157
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.066525	-0.11862	-0.16469	0.011959	0.006021	0.03133
3 Factors	$\pi = 0.1$	0.250940	-0.02256	0.03108	0.012354	0.008811	0.03082
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.171241	-0.04626	-0.02198	0.010703	0.009120	0.02397
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.092923	-0.07104	-0.07174	0.008347	0.008424	0.02640
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.015106	-0.09444	-0.11993	0.006036	0.009406	0.02097
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.064713	-0.12332	-0.16786	0.004150	0.009297	0.02094
Two Comp.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.245060	-0.02238	0.03654	0.053556	0.005032	0.06732
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.163905	-0.04662	-0.03104	0.045450	0.005361	0.06488
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.085247	-0.07087	-0.07673	0.035645	0.005492	0.05235
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.008764	-0.09532	-0.12412	0.023999	0.005743	0.04048
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.067362	-0.12043	-0.16524	0.012664	0.005727	0.02882
Unstructured	$\pi = 0.1$	0.249922	0.06448	0.02616	0.021811	0.048529	0.03801
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.170336	0.02643	-0.02451	0.019033	0.040653	0.03948
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.091818	-0.01258	-0.07581	0.015448	0.034280	0.03266
	$\pi = 0.4$	0.013838	-0.05185	-0.12380	0.010985	0.027010	0.02879
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.065132	-0.09237	-0.16962	0.005999	0.018722	0.02375

Table C.1: Bias and sample standard deviation (std dev) of estimators of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 1.5$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive bias and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best.

D Simulation results when minimal signal strength is 1



Figure D.1: The excess $d(\hat{\pi}) = \hat{\pi} - \pi$ of an estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 1$, where the dashed line marks $\hat{\pi} = \pi$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive excess and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best when $\pi < 0.4$.

		Bias			Std Dev		
		Benjamini	New	SLIM	Benjamini	New	SLIM
Block	$\pi = 0.1$	0.245957	-0.04825	0.01839	0.005497	0.011937	0.02837
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.161015	-0.09324	-0.05349	0.005513	0.012646	0.02498
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.075451	-0.14118	-0.13249	0.004933	0.011847	0.02240
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.008615	-0.18822	-0.19711	0.004885	0.011040	0.02106
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.093345	-0.23572	-0.26009	0.004702	0.012653	0.02117
Equal Corr.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.241180	-0.04626	0.14697	0.053735	0.005582	0.26926
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.155209	-0.09529	-0.05549	0.046329	0.006044	0.06793
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.071163	-0.13860	-0.12985	0.038140	0.006346	0.07068
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.012609	-0.18545	-0.19737	0.030060	0.007522	0.06367
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.096940	-0.23512	-0.26692	0.021829	0.007367	0.06070
Three Factors	$\pi = 0.1$	0.246505	-0.04425	0.01510	0.012261	0.009987	0.02951
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.160753	-0.09302	-0.05686	0.010697	0.009969	0.02676
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.075914	-0.13882	-0.12332	0.008874	0.009748	0.02715
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.008183	-0.18409	-0.19474	0.007228	0.010166	0.02765
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.093632	-0.23435	-0.26177	0.005357	0.010227	0.02490
Two Comp.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.240983	-0.04578	0.13871	0.053916	0.005523	0.27153
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.155600	-0.09186	-0.05598	0.046797	0.006392	0.07209
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.070082	-0.14165	-0.13441	0.039092	0.006409	0.07113
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.012546	-0.18511	-0.20071	0.029788	0.006578	0.06477
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.095580	-0.23234	-0.26579	0.021121	0.006424	0.06042
Unstructured	$\pi = 0.1$	0.245087	0.04575	0.02019	0.021652	0.051253	0.03633
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.159096	-0.01542	-0.05924	0.018245	0.044311	0.03805
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.075125	-0.07051	-0.12931	0.016123	0.038958	0.03538
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.009509	-0.12753	-0.19460	0.012958	0.033182	0.03458
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.094581	-0.18777	-0.26273	0.009914	0.027927	0.03491

Table D.1: Bias and sample standard deviation (std dev) of estimators of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 1$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive bias and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best when $\pi < 0.4$.

E Simulation results when minimal signal strength is 0.45



Figure E.1: The excess $d(\hat{\pi}) = \hat{\pi} - \pi$ of an estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 0.45$, where the dashed line marks $\hat{\pi} = \pi$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive excess and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best when $\pi < 0.4$.

		Bias			Std Dev		
		Benjamini	New	SLIM	Benjamini	New	SLIM
Block	$\pi = 0.1$	0.23945	-0.07003	0.13999	0.005094	0.012275	0.30106
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.14752	-0.14233	-0.06759	0.005283	0.012476	0.12139
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.05458	-0.21564	-0.17694	0.005034	0.012507	0.02591
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.03794	-0.29012	-0.26412	0.005127	0.013514	0.02565
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.12977	-0.36424	-0.35232	0.005528	0.013013	0.02554
Equal Corr.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.23544	-0.07268	0.53766	0.055891	0.005364	0.38548
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.14254	-0.14847	0.33706	0.051612	0.005972	0.39554
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.05141	-0.21878	0.14399	0.046523	0.006069	0.38112
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.04019	-0.29192	-0.02156	0.042268	0.007171	0.34644
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.13267	-0.36826	-0.16599	0.037492	0.007023	0.33717
3 Factors	$\pi = 0.1$	0.23971	-0.07115	0.08490	0.012650	0.010405	0.24650
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.14685	-0.14689	-0.06656	0.011602	0.010402	0.12239
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.05498	-0.21895	-0.16891	0.010737	0.010130	0.03146
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.03675	-0.29099	-0.25970	0.010095	0.010581	0.02957
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.13000	-0.36777	-0.35140	0.008433	0.010582	0.02901
Two Comp.	$\pi = 0.1$	0.23528	-0.07252	0.52016	0.056066	0.005478	0.38460
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.14364	-0.14537	0.32067	0.051706	0.006208	0.39345
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.05079	-0.22168	0.12641	0.047270	0.006179	0.38413
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.04020	-0.29189	-0.06215	0.041698	0.006677	0.33270
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.13161	-0.36584	-0.17868	0.037143	0.006294	0.31426
Unstructured	$\pi = 0.1$	0.23877	0.02449	0.26522	0.022070	0.054233	0.36265
	$\pi = 0.2$	0.14544	-0.05801	0.05228	0.020112	0.049378	0.29151
	$\pi = 0.3$	0.05424	-0.13505	-0.14387	0.019006	0.047700	0.14959
	$\pi = 0.4$	-0.03867	-0.21312	-0.25001	0.017243	0.044206	0.09389
	$\pi = 0.5$	-0.13083	-0.29451	-0.33146	0.015898	0.042353	0.11841

Table E.1: Bias and sample standard deviation (std dev) of estimators of the proportion π of nonzero Normal means when the minimum of the absolute values of the nonzero Normal means $\mu_* = 0.45$. A better estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π should have non-positive bias and smaller variance and be less downwardly biased. The new estimator "New" is overall the best when $\pi < 0.4$.